## Weekly National Intelligencer.

WASHINGTON: SATURDAY, AUGUST 1, 1846.

## PUBLISHED BY GALES & SEATON.

Two Dollars a year; or ONE Dollar for the first regular session of each Congress; and FIFT CENTS for the final session of each Congress; and the same for each Extra Session—payable in all cases in advance.

IN SENATE-JULY 27, 1846.

The bill for the reduction of the Tariff was then taken up;

had not the honor to-day to address a full Senate. Since the commencement of his observations on Saturday an honorable member of the Senate from one of the Southern States had vacsted his seat in that body. They would probably soon hear from that gentleman himself the reasons which led him to leave a position to which he seemed to be attached. He was not otherwise acquainted with those reasons than as he gathered them from the very extraordinary publication in the government paper of Saturday evening. He inferred from that publication that the honorable member left his seat from an inability to support the measures of the Administration now before them without violating his conscience, and from great an inating to support the measures of the Administration now before them without violating his conscience, and from great unwillingness to disoblige his party and political friends by voting against them. As that gentleman was gone he might speak of him, and in doing so he could not speak of him otherwise than as a man of character and standing, as a man of learning and attainments, of great courtesy, of unsurpassed intelligence and attention in the discharge of his public duties, and, as they all knew, (as far as they might judge of his course there,) the unfaltering and consistent friend of the present Administration.

ntry when I see a gentleman of this character hunted, defamed, according to the degree of abuse and defama-tich some writer for the government, in the paper of the

It is a disgrace to the civilization of the age, it is a disgrace to this Government, it is a disgrace to the American people.

Another circumstance not unworthy of notice I will advert to before I proceed to the few remaining observations which I intend to submit. If we may believe the current intelligence effort is making throughout the whole Republic of Mexico to sustain her in the war now carried on against her by the United States. I suppose the Government is now informed that Gen. Bravo is appointed President ad interim, and that Parades, with such forces as he can collect, is marching to the uppose, I say, that the Government is in possession of this stelligence, how well founded I know not; but they have the

diminish the necessary income of the Government.

Mr. WEDSTER then resumed and concluded his argument in prosition to the bill. Instead, however, of moving to post

impotency of this provision in the bill, which, while it availed to repeal the penal provisions of the present law which forfeit the goods in the case of fraudulent entry, left the fraudulent importer free from all penalty and secured him the full amount at which he had valued his importations, with five per cent

an exact transcript of the British law, with the exception that, under the British law, ten per cent. in addition to the valuation was to be refunded to the importer, and only five per cent. under this bill. It would be perceived that it was but an additional means put into the hands of the Secretary of the Treasury to punish fraudulent importers.

Mr. CRITTENDEN said he thought there must have

been an error committed by the framers of the bill in the use of the word "with" in place of the word "without" in the niuth section, in connexion with an intention to defraud the revenue; for he could hardly suppose it to be intended to punish an intended fraud upon the revenue by paying the importer who attempted to commit the fraud his valuation of his would be a very singular sort of punishment.

Mr. JARNAGIN said another reason why it appeared to

that penalty was an additional duty of twenty per cent. Bu that penalty was an additional duty of twenty per vent. But why enact this penalty if, in the very next section, a person undervaluing his goods should be entitled to receive from the Government five per cent. in addition to his valuation? What was to become of the revenue under such an enactment. as that? If an importer contemplated committing a fraud upon the revenue, he ought to forfeit the whole of his goods but, instead of that, here was a direct encouragement held out for the perpetration of fraud. Such a provision as that was in his continue, highly chieschonded.

was, in his opinion, highly objectionable.

Mr. McDUFFIE defended the clause. It did not, in th least, he said, interfere with existing provisions of the law upon the same subject. It was only an additional remedy or an additional security against frauds; and he thought it was an additional security against frauds; and he thought it was a very wise and saiutary provision. It was not to be em-ployed in all cases, but only in those in which the Secretary of the Treasury was consulted, and in which he believed it advantageous to the United States that the goods should be advantageous to the United States that the goods should be taken. Suppose a case where an importer invoiced his goods fifty per cent. below value. The Government, by taking the goods and selling them, though they were to pay the importer five per cent. upon them, would still be a gainer of forty-five per cent. This would not only secure the revenue, but would tend greatly to increase it. The provision embraced in the tend greatly to increase it. The provision embraced in the ninth section was intended, however, to apply to particular cases and not generally. The law in other respects would

Mr. CRITTENDEN said he had very little anxiety about the amendment now proposed, or any other amendment; but he thought that the honorable Senator from South Carolina. upon more mature reflection, would find that he was mistaken as to the meaning of the bill and as to the objects sought to be accomplished. The honorable Senator seemed to suppose that the Government, by taking the goods at the importer's valuation, and giving five per cent. in addition thereto, would make money by the transaction; but the Senator would find that it was a mistake.

Hereine december appears a state of the secondary to be frameworth to the final point of the secondary to the final point of the secondary to the final point of the secondary to the final point of the fi Under every other bill that was ever passed for the collec-tion of revenue, goods that were attempted to be fraudulently entered were forfeited. It could not be the intention of the

The law was most severe and oppressive against import-Believing that the fate of the bill in a great measure de-

FINAL PROCEEDINGS ON THE TARIFF.

Mr. WEBSTER. Will the honorable Senator allow me to ask him whether, if a certain offence were described, and an act passed imposing a certain penalty, whether by forfeiture or otherwise, and another act were passed purporting to cover the whole ground, and enacting a penalty, either in nersonam or by pecuniary mulet, the first act was not abrogated by the latter.

Mr. PENNYBACKER. This section enacts a penalty

against the person who attempts to foist upon the custom-house a false invoice. It does not propose to declare it a criminal offence. The construction given to it by the Senator from Massachusetts is not the proper one.

Mr. WEBSTER. I ask the Senator to read the last part of the seventeenth section of the existing law. He will find that the same offence is there are received for

that the same offence is there provided for.

Mr. PENNYBACKER read the clause, and continued

he proper construction.

Mr. JOHNSON, of Maryland, said that, whatever

there might have been as to the purposes of this law, he thought it was apparent now that it had been submitted precisely in the form in which it was intended that it should be; for he took for granted that the chairman of the Committee on Fiwas quite sure that the honorable Senator had not attended to the phraseology of the section, because he thought that honorthere was any thing tyrannical in declaring that no frauds should be committed upon the revenue of the United States. The error into which the Senator had fallen was in supposing that there was any analogy between this clause and the pro-visions of the act of 3d and 4th William 4th. He was surr

of amendment to this bill. I intend to vote upon any chause of amendment to this bill. I intend to vote for it on the single ground of overturning the act of 1842. I did not wish to go into the business of amendment. Amendment implies the gislation. I hope there will be no more motions to amend; but, this motion being made, I am forced to vote upon it, and must give my reasons for the vote. The motion is to strike must give my reasons for the vote. The motion is to strike out the sections which authorize the Government to constitute tiself the purchaser of the importation. This is not a new question to me; it is not the first time I have thought or talked about it. At least six months ago, in a conversation with the chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, (Mr. McKay,) I mentioned the Bettish vaction of the thirty the importance of the strike the second of the s British practice of taking the importation at the invoice price as an objection to the ad valorem system. I objected to the system, and mentioned this identical practice of the British Government as an incident of the system, and one not suitable to the genius of our Government, or perhaps consistent with our constitution. In Great Britain it was found, upon experience, that ad valorems, even to the limited extent there used, were so subject to fraud, and to frauds which could not be proved, that it was necessary to have recourse, in addition to all other penalties, to the extraordinary remedy of converting the Government into a procedural and taking the goods of

But it was not in the case of flagrant fraud-of proveely established in a court of justice. In that case, the Government, shutting its eyes upon the fraud, but willing to deprive the fraudulent importer of his undue gains, treats him as an honest man—takes his goods at his own price—and allows prehensible. The British take the goods and pay the price, and add ten yer cent. profit, on the ground of an innocent undervaluation: in the case of a fraudulent importation the importer is punished by the loss of his goods and other penalties; and this has been the case from the time of the patriarchs to the present day. Fraud was never before rewarded, except by this bill. I undertake to say it is the first bill which rewards fraud which has been seen in the annals of human le-gislation. The section in our bill, therefore, differs from the British in the great feature of application to fraudulent importations: it also differs from it in the measure of per centur allowed to the importer. The British act allows ten per cent. because that is the usual English profit on a fair importation. They therefore take the importer's goods at his own price, and at the established profit. That is treating him as a fai merchant, and carrying out the idea of the act. But our act allows only five per cent., and that not only different from the British act, but from the reason of it, and, in fact, is founded in no reason. Five per cent. is not our mercantile profit, but about twelve and a half. If, therefore, the importation is considered fair, as in Great Britain, the usual profit, in addition to the price, should be paid. But our bill goes upon the idea of fraud. It is for intention to defraud that the goods may be taken for Government use. And now, upon what principle can five per cent., or any per cent., be given on a fraud? By all our custom-house laws—by the laws of the world, from the time of the patriarchs to the present day—fiaud is a crime pun-ishable by fines and forfeitures: by no human legislation was fraud ever before rewarded. This bill gives back the whole fraud ever before rewarded. This bill gives back the whole amount of the fraud, and then gives five per cent. profit on that amount! This is incomprehensible—inconsequential—preposterous. It can only result from copying the substance of the British act without understanding it; and then, thinking ten per cent. rather a high premium on fraud, our bill reduces it to five? Why, sir, in the case of fraud, the British system forfeits the whole importation; and that is reasonable, and so have our acts always done. Our laws always forfeit for fraud, but this act rewards?

And now upon what principle can our bill propose to give five per cent.' Only upon the principle of an honest importation can any thing be allowed, and then it should be

beginning to end; yet he was so reloctant to put his hand to it, that he did not know that he would vote even for this amendment. He wanted to have nothing to do with the bill, except the plain unequivocal act of opposition. He neither wished to patch it.

Mr. LEWIS said they were very willing on his side of the chamber to take all the responsibility. The two sections which

or one who could not be convicted of fraud, but it is a forfesture of the goods for fraud. The importer is to be convicted
and stigmatized for fraud before his goods can be taken. And
how convicted? By a jury? Like a freeman in a country
of law and right? Not at all. But upon the opinion of the
appraisers. It is the opinion of the appraisers which is to
convict him of a crime, stigmatize his name, and deprive him
of his proports. retary of the Treasury, yet every body knows that the Col-lector and Secretary will take the opinion of the appraisers, and will not appraise over again, and perhaps would know nothing about it if they did.

But even if they did, what then? They are not a jury,

itizen is to be tried. The omnipotent British Parliament night do it, but our Congress cannot do it. But the British porter of whose goods it constitutes itself the purchaser, and gives him his own price, and the usual profit. We have gone further than the British Parliament, when we have no right to go as far. We have no right to constitute ourselves the purchaser of a citizen's property, even at his own price, and the addition of the current profit. We have no right to do this, even as a fair business transaction, as the British act supposes it to be, much less to convict a citizen of fraud without judge Verily, we live in strange times, when such novelties are brought forward. I will vote for this amendment, but I hope

stances, and act like statesmen in perfecting a bill, I should be glad to go into it, and contribute my labors to make a good in extraordinary circumstances—in a conjuncture which does not often occur. In all three divisions of the legislative power not often occur. In all three divisions of the legislative power there is accord on the leading character of a tariff. The President and a majority of each House of Congress are against the tariff of 1842; they are for a revenue tariff. But a revenue tariff is not a genus without a species. It may have many species; and judgment, reason, knowledge, consideration, deliberation, may all be requisite to decide which species of the genus should be adopted. enus should be adopted

fortunate circumstances in which the party now finds itself, and could act like legislators, I should feel proud to bring all the contribution of my knowledge and industry to perfecting the details of a bill. But we are not able to act up to that I can vote for the bill as overturning the act of 1842, and wish to give but that vote alone. I am ready to give that vote, and hope I shall be spared from voting on further propositions

sity for delaying the progress of the bill a single moment, but it appeared to him that the nature and purposes and effect of his clause were misapprehended, either on one side of the House or on both. The Senator from Missouri had taken a view of it totally opposite to that taken on the other side. So far from regarding it as a clause intended to favor the importer, and to facilitate frauds, the Senator from Missouri seemed ter, and to facilitate frauds, the Senator from Missouri seemed to think it a very oppressive provision, and one which was scarcely justified by the constitution. Now, he thought this difference of opinion between the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Kentucky, at least showed one thing, which was, that the Senator from Kentucky was entirely mistaken when he supposed that the clause was intended to apply to cases of undervaluation without an intention to defraud the revenue. It expressly applied to fraudulent undervaluation, intended to defraud the revenue. He thought if the Senator would advert to the phrascology of the section, he would at intended to defraud the revenue. He thought if the Senator would advert to the phraseology of the section, he would at once perceive that there was nothing unconstitutional, harsh, oppressive, or unusual in it. If it were intended to apply to cases of undervaluation where fraud was contemplated, the Senator from Missouri was certainly not justified in regarding it as a harsh law, when, instead of forfeiting the goods altogether, it left it to the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury to take the goods and pay the importer his valuation, and five per cent. upon that valuation, to cover the expense of importation. This was not all; it was law which was intended to give an additional remedy against frands, not can act conformable to the British act, but with a total misconception of the British act. Our bill differs from the British in being applicable to fraudulent, instead of innocent importations; and it differs from it in not giving the importer his fair but it would be very harsh if applied to cases where fraud to the cases where fraud but it would be very harsh if applied to cases where fraud to the cases where fraud hit, to come to the point made on the other side, Did this ninth section repeal any clause of any law whatever that was not repugnant to it? Why, the law of 1842 contained a clause providing for the forfeiture of the goods in cases of smuggling. Did this clause repeal that? It provided for forfeiture in cases of false swearing; but did it relate to those of smuggling at all? Certainly not. There was not a single clause in the act of 1842 repealed by this clause; there was not a clause in the act of 1842 relating to the same

the Secretary did not think proper to avail himself of the pow-er given by this clause, was there any law under which the offender could be punished? And, if no law were provided, the matter would be completely in the power of fraudulent nporters. It was merely giving to the Secretary power to unish frauds which were provided for by no other law. He rould appeal to any tribunal on earth, and pledge what little route appear to any thounar on earth, and piedge what little eputation he possessed, that this clause did not repeal any ther. He trusted the amendment would not prevail. Mr. JARNAGIN said he must be permitted to say a single rord in reference to this bill, which had lain in the Treasury

months, and on the sixth day of July had made its appearance in the Senate still unfledged. He could scarcely tell to what to every Senator present if it was not his right as well as his duty so to change it as to make it acceptable to the country? What were they about to do? To unsettle the whole bus ness pursuits of the country. Under such circumstances he felf it to be his imperative duty so to change or modify the bill that it would be productive of the least possible amount of evil. And he was not to be told that they had not time to do it; that the Senate had not time to deliberate. It was no fault of his that they had so little time. He took no part of the blame; none at all. And now, for the mere purpose of accomplishing one great object, for the mere purpose of carrying through an Administration measure, they were to aping through an Administration measure, they were to a prove, without consideration, a bill that was not expected stand, even if it became a law by adventitious circumstance the usual profit, as in Great Britain. But, as a profit, five per cent. is a robbery of the merchant: it defrauds him out of seven and a half per cent. As a fraudulent importation, as the bill declares it to be, it is a premium on fraud; it is an encouragement to crime! It is a vice and folly in legislation, matter, it was true, under instructions, and instructions

Our bill goes upon fraud, and takes the goods for frauds. | ter on all the great interests of the country, that it must be working most diligently to fulfil the decrees of the Baltimore would be the same, rather than throw himself into ter on all the great interests of the country, that it must be altered entirely before it could receive the least approbation from him. If he should set out to amend it, there was nothing to amend by. He was called upon by the friends of the bill to say what guards he would propose to place round the collection of the duties as here specified. That was a task which pertained to the authors of the bill. Mr. C. was opposing it as a whole, he fell title interest in its details.

amendment:
"To commit the bill to the Committee on Finance, with instructions to restore the specific duties prescribed by the act of the 30th of August, 1842."

Mr. C. said he had been an attentive listener during this Mr. C. said he had been an attentive listener during this whole debate—a debate which had now, he believed, been continued for a week, and had turned chiefly on the question of substituting a general ad valorem principle for the specific duties in the present law. He was well satisfied with the argument on that subject which had been made by his friends. He should not undertake to add to it, but was willing to rest the case on those arguments. Before he said a word about minor alterations in the bill, he must know the sense of the Senate on both the motions he had prepared; for it must be evident that if either of them should be adopted the whole charvident that if either of them should be ad acter of the measure must be changed. When that question was settled, he should then decide whether it was worth whil by asking that the question might be taken by yeas and nays. The first resolution having been read— Mr. JARNAGIN produced and read the instructions of th

Legislature of Tennessee, under which he felt bound to act; and, as the terms of this resolution directly conflicted with those and, as the terms of this resolution directly conflicted with those instructions, he should be constrained to vote against it.

Mr. CALHOUN said he was very glad the Senator from Delaware had made this motion; it was a perfectly fair one, and it brought up the question whether the tariff of 1842 should or should not stand. The great objection to that tariff should or should not stand. The great objection to that tariff was directed against the minimums and the specific duties. Should the motion of the honorable Senator succeed, its effect

must be to leave the present law untouched. Mr. JARNAGIN now took the floor, and went into a speech ly the duty of changing many of its provisions. In conformity to his instructions, he should go for ad valorem duties, and against both minimums and specific duties; but, while he held he considered himself at full liberty to use his utmost exertio to get the bill amended so as to render it as little injurious der obligation to vote for any and every bill which contain ments would proceed from a committee in which there was a

A long colloquy hers took place between Messrs, TURNEY and JARNAGIN as to the true meaning of the instructions they had both received from their Legislature—Mr. TURNEY insisting that in private conversations they had agreed that the

from the seat of Government. He must return and convene his council before he could fill the vacancy, and to do this and to bring the representative here would occupy at least twenty days, long before which time the fate of the bill would have been decided in the Senate.

The question was here taken on Mr. Clayron's first reso-

"To commit the bill to the Committee on Pinance with in structions to restore he specific duties prescribed by the act of the 30th of August, 1842."

And it was rejected-ayes 26, noes 29. And the second resolution having been read as follows:

"That the bill be committed to the Committe on Finan in all cases where any loreign raw material is taxed to the pre-judice of any mechanic or manufacturer, so that no other or higher duty shall be collected on any such raw material than is provided by the act of 30th of August, 1842. And further so to regulate all the duties imposed by this bill as to raise a revenue sufficient for the exigencies of the country."

Mr. SEVIER inquired from Mr. Clarrox further informa-

on as to the meaning and effect of the resolution.

Mr. CLAYTON briefly explained; after which

Mr. R. JOHNSON called for a division of the question

and it was divided accordingly, so as to be put first on that part of the resolution which read as follows: That the bill be committed to the Committee

with instructions to remove the new duties imposed by said bill in all cases where any foreign raw material is taxed to the prejudice of any mechanic or manufacturer, so that no other or higher duty shall be collected on any such raw material than is provided by the act of the 30th of August, 1842;" and then on the residue of the resolution; and it was so divided accordingly, and the question being on the first part of

Senate had rejected the former, which was of so much greater importance. The present resolution would operate on a class of articles which were comparatively of little consequence. He felt a reluctance to vote for this after the Senate had rejected the other, because he was against the bill altogether. It was such a bill that no amendment in its details would senate had desirable and distinct the senate had rejected the former, which was of so much greater importance. The present resolution would operate on a class of articles which were comparatively of little consequence. He felt a reductance to vote for this after the Senate had rejected the other, because he was against the bill altogether. It was such a bill that no amendment in its details would senate had disained. such a bill that no amendment in its details would secure his approbation or favor. Instead of voting on any amendment, he preferred that the friends and opponents of the bill should now at once come up face to face and front to front. [Strong expressions of approbation on the Democratic side of the chamber.]

Mr. C. said he did not want to make the bill any better;

but, if it should pass, what would the committee do? They would only turn over the bill, and put a little new color on it, so as to make it a little more like God's truth, and then we

to understand what this resolution really meant; for it seemed to him quite unintelligible. The object, if he comprehended it, was to take the duty imposed by the bill off of all articles of raw material. If so, he supposed hemp was one; and he took it for granted the gentleman meant that the committee must reduce the duty on hemp. Was wool another? He supposed they must reduce the duty on wool; and, if so, how much?

cles were. If he found any of them at present free of duty, the resolution required him to leave them free of duty; if he required him to report the same duty in the present bill.

And now a word or two as to what had been said by his friend from Kentucky. If any gentleman took it for granted that Mr. C. meant that all who voted for this resolution of instructions would of course be bound to vote for the bill if it should e so amended, he was greatly mistaken. Mr. C. conside the doctrines of the Secretary of the Treasury. There was no doubt of that. He presumed that must be evident to every man. He did not propose the resolution as a peace offering; gentlemen might vote upon it as they pleased. Mr. C. offered it that he might show his hand, and that the world might see he and made at least an effort to save the interests of the mechan

put by the Chair, and decided, by yeas and nays, as follows: YEAS—Messrs. Archer, Barrow, Berrien, Cameron, Cilley, John M. Clayton, Thomas Clayton, Corwin, Crittenden, Davis, Dayton, Evans, Greene, Huntington, Jarnagin, Johnson, of Louisians, Johnson, of Maryland, Mangum, Miller, Morchead, Niles, Pearce, Phelps, Simmons, Sturgeon, Upham, Webster, and Woodbridge—28.

NAYS—Messrs. Allen, Ashley, Atchison, Atherton, Bagby, Beuton, Breese, Bright, Calhoun, Cass, Chalmers, Colquitt, Dickinson, Dix, Fairfield, Hannegan, Houston, Lewis, McDuffie, Pennybacker, Rusk, Semple, Sevier, Speight, Turney, Westcott, and Yulee—27.

So the first rection of the resolution of the resolution of the resolution of the resolution.

So the first portion of the resolution was agreed to. The uestion on the latter part of the resolution was then put and

arried by precisely the same vote.

And then, on motion of Mr. BREESE, the Senate adjourned.

IN SENATE-JULY 28, 1846. Mr. BENTON rose and asked the indulgence of the Se

ate for a few moments, that he might recur to a proceeding of yesterday. He had not arrived in his seat yesterday momto the Senate, or he would have availed himself of that opportunity to make the remarks which he was now about to make. Had he been in his seat at that moment, he would have made a statement to the Senate of what he knew as to the causes which led to Mr. Haywood's resignation, and of the motives which had induced him to tesign his seat in the Senate. Mr. Haywood was absent at the time the tariff bill came from the House of Representatives. At the very first moment of his appearance in the Senate, after his return, he took me aside and imparted to me his insuperable objections to the bill. He stated that he could not go for it, and proposed to entered to a mend it. I gave him to understand very pointedly, and did the Senate subsequently, that my own objections to the bill were very strong, and that the only reason why I should vote for it was that we might get rid of the act of 1842; that, as for any amendment, I deemed it utterly impossible, in the present state of things, that there could be the deliberation necessary to perfect the details of the measure. Mr. Hayshould vote for it was that we might get rid of the act of 1842; that, as for any amendment, I deemed it utterly impossible, in the present state of things, that there could be the deliberation necessary to perfect the details of the measure. Mr. Haywood then signified an intention to move a postponement. I told him it was impossible that it could prevail. He then said that he would resign his seat; and from that time his mind remained immovable. emained immovable.

I give these details to show that his mind was consistent

Mr. MANGUM said he was very much gratified that the Senator from Missouri had thought proper to advert to this matter. He was the more so, inasmuch as the organ of the Government, in this city, had assailed Mr. Harwoon's public and private character with such a degree of ferocity, and, in his judgment so unjustly, that he thought every liberal Senator should stand forward and sustain and commend from the late Senator in political sentiment; that difference had long existed, and was likely to continue; but political considerations could never be permitted to interfere, so far as he was concerned, with feelings of personal respect for a gentle-

never would have abandoned his seat, but would have taken the responsibility of defeating the measure; but, finding that walks of private life; and for this he was assailed his vote was not likely to be effective, and that the result vituperation and abuse. He repeated that no vindic

mind to retire from the Senste, Mr. Haywood, be

Sir, (continued Mr. M.) I do most cheerfully and cordially concur in the sentiments expressed by the honorable Senator from Missouri, that Mr. Haywood, in forming his purpose, was under the influence of none other than considerations high, elevated, pure, and honorable. He (Mr. Haywood) might despise a rabid press—to abuse is its vocation. He might despise the servitors of power, and their vile, mercenary, and sycophantic followers—the jackalls that would despise the sanctuary of the grave, and exhume reputation to be offered in sacrifice, in burnt sacrifices, to the passions of their masters and corrupters—and repose upon the esteem of good and just and liberal men.

Mr. M. felt sure that Mr. Haywood at no period of his life enjoyed more of the respect and consideration of liberal men.

Democratic Senators who have recently rendered signal and distinguished service to the country upon another great question—Oregon; and, co-operating with the Whigs, saved the seountry from all the destructive horrors of a British war. (Mr. M. referred to his late colleague and the distinguished Senators from Missouri and Mississippi.) With the profoundest polifical difference upon the most of questions, he (Mr. M.) yet felt that his State had lost an able, vigilant, and faithful public servent, and he a colleague entitled to his respect and kindly consideration—at all events, to this naked act of justice to his integrity, purity, and perfect conscientiousness in this last act, his resignation.

Mr. DIX desired to state, as this subject had been introduced, that Mr. Haywood, more than a week ago, had ex-

Mr. DIX desired w state, as this subject had been introduced, that Mr. Haywaod, more than a week ago, had expressed to him his intention either of resigning his seat in the Senate, or of voting against the bill. He had endeavored to dissuade him from resigning, but, as it appeared, without effect. He was happy to avail aimself of this occasion to bear testimony to the elevation of character and high sense of honor of the late Senator.

Mr. NILES, after a few remarks, which were not distinct which is the callety proceeded to state his full and

tempted to be brought to bear upon the action of Senators, and that sort of influence arising from intimidation, which they were informed had, in other countries and in other times, in revolutionary times, controlled other great legislative bodies? The influence of combinations, of associations,

instruments of death?

Sir, said Mr. Nilks, these are evil times. If we are not to be left free to act here on all questions, and especially upon those of the greatest magnitude, especially upon those affecting most deeply the interests of our constituents, then, our legislation will neither receive nor deserve public confijudgment, but of these deleterious influences? Sir, I am gra-tified that this thing has been alluded to. Truly, we have fallen upon evil times; and, sir, when the history of these times shall come to be written, as written they must be, the pen of the historian will scarcely be able to do them justice. For one, having taken some responsibility in regard to this matter, I have no fear as to what will be the public judgment

I give these details to show that his mind was consistent and uniform in regard to the measure before the Senate. I believe there was never a man on earth who acted upon purer, higher, nobler motives, than he has in regard to this matter, in every thing that he did up to the time of his resignation. I endeavored to dissuade him from the act. All that I desire to say now is, to repeat that I believe there never was a man who, in the performance of a public duty, was actuated by purer, higher, or more noble motives than Mr. Hawwood. correctness or incorrectness of the judgment of the Senator in determining upon the course which he had pursued, he had been actuated by a sincere conviction as to what his duty as an honest man and a patriot required of him.

Mr. BAGBY addressed a few remarks to the Senate to the

> Mr. CRITTENDEN said he had never seen Mr. HATwoon, nor had any acquaintance with him, until they became associated in that body; and for a time, owing to trifling and

send it? To the very committee who had brought this measure into the Senate. They would find some way of getting round the instructions so as to comply with them in form, but defeat their purpose: they would sugar the dose which they sent to him to be awallowed, but in no form or shape would he ever swallow it. He had always thought the true battle of the friends of the present law was to meet their adversaries boldly front to front.

[Acclamations on the opposite side: "That's the course;" [Acclamations on the opposite side: "That's the course;" and he (Mr. M.) hoped, when he should lesse his eyes upon earth, that he might leave with the belief that her character was unspotted and unstained by those upon whom she had devolved high responsibility, and that, for many prosperity and in profound peace. The country was in a state of happy prosperity and in profound peace. The Administration had made a war that they might get back the peace. After getting it into a war which required all the resources we could raise, they reduced duties to increase the revenue. They had been digging vaults and cellars, putting on locks and bars to been digging vaults and cellars, putting on locks and bars to be been digging vaults and cellars, putting on locks and bars whom who had any knowledge of Mr. Hav woon's purpose to resign, unless by inference, (for he seemed, recently, to be uneasy and unhappy;) and he knew the foundation of the world, withenseed management like with the seal of the present is with the seal of the character or the conduct of the late Senator from North Carolina. If his character for integrity and hencesty of purpose had been dignited moderation, as pure as it was unspected and unstained by those upon the character was unspected and unstained by those upon the character or the conduct of the late Senator from North Carolina. If his character for integrity and hencesty of purpose had been dignited, or an attack of the most perfect delicary with the belief that her character was unspected and unstained by thos